DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 294 HE 001 754

AUTHOR Jerome, Judson
TITLE Friends World College. Report on Evaluation Visit, September 16-17, 1969.
INSTITUTION Antioch Coll., Columbia, Md.
PUB DATE [69]
NOTE 14p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.80
DESCRIPTORS College Environment, Colleges, *Educational Innovation, Evaluation, *Experimental Colleges, Foreign Countries, *Higher Education, *Innovation, *Institutional Role, Language Programs, Travel
IDENTIFIERS *Friends World College

ABSTRACT

This report discusses Friends World College (FWC), an experimental and innovative institution on Long Island. FWC is committed to creating change agents to bring about a better world. It considers itself an agency for bringing students into contact with resources, and it considers the functions of its program to be less in the realm of supplying information and more in the realm of formation of character and achievement of direction and purpose. It is impossible to assess the College by conventional standards, because it is not a conventional institution. This report reviews the admission criteria, which includes the desire by the applicant to change the world; living accommodations (barracks about to be torn down); the educational program which demands the keeping of a journal by the students; the living and work experience in foreign countries; the language program; accreditation and evaluation procedures; the financial situation, and the institution's governance. (AF)

ED043294

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FRIENDS WORLD COLLEGE

Report on Evaluation Visit
September 16-17, 1969
by Judson Jerome, Antioch Columbia

In evaluating Friends World College one must keep in mind a number of implicit and explicit characteristics which distinguish this institution from other colleges and universities.

First of these, I would say, is a sense of mission. Customarily colleges pretend to an intellectual neutrality, the presupposition being that the institution itself stands for no particular point of view other than support of freedom of inquiry. FWC is committed to creating change agents to bring about a better world along the lines rather explicitly delineated by Morris Mitchell. This commitment is not merely rhetoric in the literature; it was alluded to by most of the people to whom I spoke at FWC and functions as a principle in making choices -- e.g., in admitting students. FWC has taken public positions on a number of controversial issues, such as in their opposition to the war in Viet Nam. While they conscientiously attempt to see that opposing points of view are presented in their program, there seems to be little ambibuity about the institutional commitment, and individuals in the administration, faculty, and student body share many quite clearly defined attitudes.

Secondly, FWC seems not to conceive of itself as a collection of resources so much as an agency for bringing students into contact with resources. That is, there is relatively less effort to accumulate and assemble information in the form of curriculum, faculty and library than to use the world and surrounding communities as sources of information. The faculty bring in lecturers from outside, conduct field trips in the surrounding area and recommend academic and other ways of learning which can be made available to their students. This is true of the program on the North American campus and is undoubtedly more true in the foreign programs.

Third -- and perhaps this is related to the sense of mission referred to above -- FWC seems to use economy as a means of education. The poverty of the school is to some degree willful: I understand the Board of Trustees is considering reducing tuition for next year even though some 50% of the budget already must be raised annually. The on-campus work program is perhaps less important as a means of getting tasks done at low cost than as a way of maintaining a spirit of membership in the student body. Similarly, the device of providing room and board for faculty, with its complex arrangements for reimbursement for meals, etc., may, indeed, save the college some money; but I imagine its principal effect is to bind the faculty close to the college in dedication, self-sacrifice, and a sense of ownership and membership. The economy achieved in living arrangements for students, meals, study-travel arrangements --

HE001.754

the general sense of "roughing it" -- all seems, in part, a deliberate appeal to a student's sense of adventure, of pioneering, of making-do. Living economically is not only a necessity, in other words, but a virtue and a source of excitement and camaraderie.

Fourth, and also related to the mission referred to above (as is every aspect of the program!), the religious basis of FWC creates a special atmosphere in the program. This seems to be generally a non-theological religion, -- but one which emphasizes reverence for human potential. Personal caring and sensitivity are immediately evident as one comes to this campus from any other. One senses also a discipline and underlying seriousness which might be said to be of religious derivation. One might quibble about the meaning of religious; I suppose I am using it to refer to a quality of spiritual commitment and love, a belief that life has meaning and purpose. As I met the students, staff, faculty, and administrators of FWC I was continually struck by such qualities as humility, openness, warmth and dedication. The place has the "feel" of an intentional community or of a religious brotherhood.

Fifth, it seems to be assumed that the function of the program is less in the realm of supplying information and more in the realm of formation of character and achievement of direction and purpose. Obviously, to be effective change agents its graduates need to have some very specific information and skills; but these vary so much with time and individual situations that it seems uneconomical to invest much energy in teaching them <u>per se</u>. A proper evaluation of graduates of such a school might be less concerned with What Do You Know? than withWhat Do You Believe Is Right? and How serious are you about achieving it? Surely, virtue cannot be taught. Just as surely, it can be acquired and developed. If you have as clear a frame work of values as seemed evident in this institution, it is possible to make at least some tentative judgments as to whether a person is progressing. I did not hear the word <u>virtue</u> used on the FWC campus, and I doubt that many there would be very comfortable with it as a term to describe what they are seeking to instill in themselves and those they deal with. Perhaps a more neutral piece of jargon might be <u>motivation</u>. The educational program seems to be aimed at developing sensitivity and commitment. Inescapably, knowledge is acquired in the process of living in many parts of the world and being systematically exposed to a wide range of critical, definitive experiences. But I would almost regard the knowledge as a by-product and remain somewhat skeptical of its worth, since it must be so continually revised.

Sixth, and perhaps related to the last point, I would point out that the prevalent spirit of seeking is somewhat incompatible with the conventional academic stance of finding or having found. The sense of omission does not seem to have produced the sense of dogma.

The most profound and most honest answer to most questions of significance is "I don't know." Since this is so little recognized as adequate in most academic institutions, the criteria for measuring them are exceptionally inadequate for measuring FWC.

Seventh, and related, is the high value put upon modesty and honesty. I quote from one the journals:

> What the HELL am I doing in a college with a group of people who don't give a damn about world problems, except by mouth, not about reading, or writing, or studying...so here I am with a bunch of people who don't give much of damn, who had to go to college, so they applied here and got in because they had to fill up the class, and every one of them knows it...and it is, after all, so easy to stay in...-no grades, no homework, even the journal doesn't have to be particularly well written.. you can even get out of the pot rap if you talk enough high sentiments and sweet-tongueing at the right times... Actually, I have no right to complain, since the resistance to work lies right in myself, and not in the program or any place else...but sometimes I feel I'd have a better chance if there were a few stable people around, a few interested in the program who weren't staff or faculty, some whose enthusiasm could help me to have little more hope...Also I wish I were a little older, a little more able to overcome or rationalize my emotional hangups, a little more sensitive to other people...or else with a group who were a little older, who could look through their hangups to a greater world, maybe even go out into it, instead of staying in their cultural cysts-- . eh?

In general, reading the journals and talking to individuals -- both staff and students -- one continually encounters what amounts almost to a compulsion to reveal what others might be inclined to hide. So much of our academic life has become game-playing in which the point is to conceal deficiency and score by either knowing or faking the answers, that it is disconcerting to attempt to evaluate a program which seems so intent upon disarming one by anticipating one's awareness of its defects. This attitude is highly conducive to education, as it conditions the learner continually to search out his own weaknesses, confess them and work relentlessly to correct them. Young people in our culture have a great need to demonstrate that they know, that they are capable, that they are right; in this situation it is difficult to bring them to ask What do I know? Of what am I ignorant, How do I need to grow and change? I believe that the FWC program <u>is</u> helping young people assume that posture. An evaluator must keep in mind, however, that when they are showing us their worst, they are showing us their best.

In short, we must watch our language as we try to assess the worth of what we have seen. If the specifications we are working from were designed for evaluating apartment houses, and we applied them to evaluating a tree, we might come to some amusing conclusions- that the structure lacked form or rigor, that its plumbing and wiring were insufficient, that it did not sufficiently protect its inhabitants from the elements, etc. We would, of course, fail to note its inner form, discipline, strength, beauty, and ---and a characteristic unknown in apartment houses --- its capacity for inner growth and reproduction.

I will begin with the admissions procedure and comment in turn on a number of aspects of the program. For the first time this year FWC was able to exercise a great deal of selectivity in its choice of applicants. I understand that there are some 450 applications for 50 places -- and those concerned with admissions reported that they were able to make better judgments because they had a clear idea of what they were looking for. For example, I was told that they want young people who are serious about wanting to change the world. It was insufficient that they might have participated in demonstrations and such activities. Had they actually <u>done</u> anything which indicated a willingness to work and to learn and to commit themselves? Such a criterion brings up an interesting question. Is the mission of the college such that they are justified in collecting students who are already well along on the route towards becoming the program's ideal product? A common mistake we make in education is to provide it for those who need it least and eliminate those who need it most! For example, a college which has "high" entrance requirements, measured by test scores and academic achievements, protects itself against failure by quaranteeing before admission that its students are academically competent. Imagine running a reducing parlor only for women who weighed less than 120 pounds. There may be some social need for institutions of such refinement -- but not to the extent that we have created them in the academic world. Similarly, one might imagine admitting to a school for revolutionaries only committed Maoists. This is justified only if the external objective -- bringing about the revolution -- it more important than the education of people. One might question whether the young people who need FWC are not, specifically, those who show very little inclinations to change the world, who are woefully unaware of or indifferent to the world's problems. Although our visit to FWC was early in the semester it was evident that already there was considerable homogeneity of mind.

I think it is unfortunate that there need be any admissions criteria at all, beyond those nearly physical ones which enable one to predict whether a person can survive in a program which requires a great deal of travel in strange places -- physical endurance and enough maturity to survive. I wouldn't want to eliminate people because they were committed to social change, nor those who are too

little committed. Similarly, I believe most other criteria, either subjectively or objectively measured, are sufficiently questionable that no clear argument can be made for one choice above another. However, unfortunately, FWC has a real problem of economics. They are simply too frail a program to take an inordinate number of risks. They are forced continually to be judging whether a person is going to be able to take it without bringing injury to himself or to the program in highly exposed settings. For this self-protective reason they may well have to guard against emotional instability, vagueness of purpose, low motivation, and other qualities which increase the risks. The only warning I would issue is that they not confuse selection made for these purposes with those made for educational reasons. They will move from being legitimately self-protective to becoming exploititive and self-serving if they insure that they always send into the field a cadre of wholesome, brighteyed, dedicated idealists.

The only suggestion that I have to offset this danger is that they open more centers. If the 450 applicants could have been accommodated in nine centers they might have been able to serve a broader, and perhaps deeper, educational purpose. I realize, of course, that this is not a practical solution for the immediate future. But I would suggest that FWC think of some way of replacating itself, extending the network idea so that more young people can have the benefits of this kind of program.

When the students arrive at Mitchel Gardens they must receive a very educational jolt. I believe the barracks are one of the college's most valuable assets -- and it is a pity they are to be lost. While I realize that it would be phony to try to construct shabbiness on the Livingston campus, I would recommend that a great deal of conscious attention be given the matter of low-cost and unconventional housing. At present, the yurt and Mitchel Gardens are a kind of embryo of the kind of campus to be born. I would like to imagine the new campus containing a wide variety of experimental structures so that the living experience there can be a workshop in considering how the world is to be housed. And I would hope that the new campus would embody, as does Mitchel Gardens, the message that there are more important things in life than elegance.

At first I thought that the Livingston campus was a poor alternative because of its isolation from the mainstream of society. On further reflection I have come to think that this may be an advantage. As Jake Oser pointed out to me, these students are so immediately catapulted into direct experience in the world, there may be some reason for an initial period of seclusion. Of course, even during the initial semester there are frequent field trips into other environments.

Perhaps FWC is serving some purpose by occupying the Livingston campus, with all its seductive qualities, because it thereby prevents someone from using it for a college which would, indeed, separate its students from life.

In general I prefer to see colleges get out of the business of housing and feeding students, as these functions inevitably bring with them an undesirable intrusion into people's lives and build dependency as well as limit freedom. I don't see how FWC will ever be able to escape this problem, however, as its foreign program depends upon the college's helping to make economical travel arrangements and at least some intitial provision for housing and feeding those who arrive in distant sites. From what I was able to detect I believe FWC handles this matter exceptionally well. There is an undeniable charm about the dining room in Mitchel Gardens. The collaborative work program helps foster a good group spirit, and I gather that there is very little interference with the way students live in the dormitories. There may, however, be some danger of paternalism (or maternalism) particularly when the principle of the college's providing housing extends to the faculty as well as the students. The practice of making no distinction between tuition, room and board, and providing room and board for faculty would seem to me to have some interesting effects -- both good and bad. It increases the sense of membership, making the program resemble as it does in many ways, a religious order. No doubt it saves income tax for the faculty -- a justifiable way of helping the government subsidize the program. And, of course, it must provide both the economies and equalities resulting from all forms of socialization. The bad effects are limitation of choice and fostering of dependency -- but I gather that there are sufficient opportunities for independence elsewhere in the program to make this less of a problem than it might be otherwise.

I was impressed by the quality of the two seminars I visited and believe that in the design of the six weeks orientation program there is an excellent balance between seminars, field experiences, and periods of free study and personal advising. I was amused to see the ineffectuality of bibliographies. These seem to me to be an effort to convince oneself, one's colleagues, and the students of academic soundness -- a device strangely out of keeping with the educational philosophy of the program. We have learned, have we not, that there is little point in loading students with reading material, especially the mere names of reading material, before they have seen the need of, and developed an appetite for more information. My own reaction to a bibliography is invariably to be impressed and depressed: I generally do not know where to begin, and since there is obviously so much that I do not know and ought to know I find myself

paralyzed and tend to turn away altogether. That is, it may be that bibliographies actually discourage reading. I am afraid that libraries have the same effect on me. I find it hard to concentrate on one book when I am surrounded by so many others I wish I had read.

At FWC books are apparently an enormous burden. Walking around the stored piles of them on the Livingston campus I was sickened with a sense of waste and futility. I can't imagine a time when students, in their brief semesters on the North American Campus, will have much time or inclination to use them. And I wondered whether they were worth the monumental task of sorting, cataloguing, shelving, and maintaining them. I wonder whether FWC ought to be in the li-- brary business at all. Rather I would like to think of a lounge-like type learning center with a wide variety of resources -- well-selected, displayed, fluidly available. The lovely little library at Mitchel Gardens is an excellent start. I think the emphasis should be upon expendable material -- paper-backs and periodicals, continually replaced. Students should be invited to carry away and keep material that has been in the center for a month or so. There ought to be a good deal of audio visual learning resources, programmed teaching machines, slide-tape presentations for individual access, film, etc. A basic collection of bound and rather permanetly kept books is, of course, a desirable part of such a learning center -- but, in my view, has a much lower priority. Books should be added to such a collection with the same care that paintings are selected for hanging in museums. As for the books stored at Livingston, I think I would have each student going abroad carry a carton with him to distribute to the needy. I mean this quite seriously; books are more needed in almost any part of the world than they are on Long Island. Please do not misunderstand me; I believe that reading is a terribly important part of education. I only regret that we do so much in our educational institutions to make it uppopular. If Mr. Harman sold radios the way scholars sell books, he would soon be as poor as the scholars.

I was very impressed by the journals that I read, even those which the staff regarded as "poor." One of the latter was written by a girl who is very obviously having great difficulty adjusting to her experience in Mexico. Her writing was, by conventional standards, very sloppy - with atrocious spelling, punctuation, and sentence structure. I found myself, nonetheless, involved in her story in the way I was by Catcher in the Rye. There was little evidence that she was learning much about Mexico or anything else outside herself and her friends - but it was equally clear that she was going to be unable to learn much until she worked her way through her personal problems. Included was a quite unfavorable comment by a faculty member, castigating her for her excessive self-involement. Not knowing the girl or the situation any better than I do, I have no opinion as to whether this was valuable comment in terms of helping

her to grow, expand, and learn. But it illustrated dramatically some of the difficulties and potentialities of the foreign experience. We really haven't much choice about the human material we are given to work with as educators - or, if we make such choices, we might be accused of making our own lives easier at the expense of fulfilling our educational mission. The response I felt very strongly as I read her journal was that at least this was real. I have read so much student writing in academic formats which was dominated by conformism, pretense and illusion, that I was grateful for having, as I read these journals, some insight into what was really going on in student's minds. I suppose that the question might be raised whether any of us have a right to know such intimate details, but, on the other hand, a student comes into an educational program in some respects as an ailing person goes into a doctor's office. Some of the same ethics which surround medical practice must necessarily surround education. There's certainly not much point in attempting to help a person's mental growth if we are denied, or if we deny ourselves, access to the student's mental life. (And I can see no way of making a clean separation between mind and emotion). There is no question in my mind that being in Mexico -- or in some alien environment was crucial in bringing to a focus the girl's learning needs.

Other journals I read were much richer in factual content about environments from far above the Arctic Circle to deepest Africa and most poverty-ridden India. Most of the data was experiential, of course. I remember how, before going to live in Spain for a period, I stocked up in London with a long shelf of books about Spain, believing that the direct experience would lead to reading. To some extent it did: I found the books valuable. Many remained unread -- and many remain unread today. Partly this is because first-hand experience often has an authenticity which makes written material seem relatively pallid and invalid. More importantly, it finally occurred to me that it was absurd for me to be sitting in my <u>piso</u> in Spain reading books when Spain lay all about me. Had I had the opportunity to follow up when I returned home, I would surely have done much more study, and my reading would have been richly enhanced by my experience. But my point is that it is an illusion to think that students are going to read a great deal when they are in a foreign setting, and it is at least questionable whether that is educationally desirable.

Again we must consider economy. Should there, after a period of experience or education, be provided a period of reflection and study? For example, my understanding of Spanish civilization would surely have been deepened had I been able to take time to study further after my return to the United States instead of pitching myself again into my immediate life here. On the other hand everything that is done is done instead of something else. If a student goes directly from India to Japan and one inundation in experience is

followed by a different kind of inundation in experience, there are certain gains which would not occur if the first inundation were followed by a period of reflection and abstract study. You pays your nickel and takes your choice. Obviously this program could move in the direction of one kind of depth by limiting the number of foreign experiences, making them longer, and building in more study. All this would be done at the expense of values which the program is now achieving - and I am not confident that either choice can be adequately defended against the other. By the same token one might argue that the girl who was having such trouble in Mexico might have worked out her therapeutic needs in San Francisco as easily. That seems to me rather irrelevant. The fact is, she did have the Mexico experience and it was serving an important function in her life.

The same kind of question may be raised in regard to language study. I would like to say at the outset that I am highly suspicious of the choice being made to use the Experiment in International Living language schools - though it is interesting enough that it is certainly worth some experimentation, if the right questions continue to be raised. Let me consider the issues I see involved one by one.

First, I got the implication that in some respects this program might serve as a hatchet job to eliminate students from going abroad who might be unable to cope with experience. That is, because it is a relatively highly structured program, in comparison to the activities on the North American Campus, it would serve as a test of whether a student was able to cope with academic demands. It might be a way of evading responsibility by giving to a third party the unpleasant job of making negative decisions about students. If FWC does not believe in formal courses, however, they do not get any better if they occur in Vermont. Its efficiency might have overtones of inhumanity about it. God knows we have difficulty maintaining our belief in free learning against the odds provided by a society which does not believe in it at all. Are we saying that free learning is good for everything except foreign languages? Doesn't that open the door for someone to say to us, Well, how about mathematics? And another to say, Well, at least they should have a good drilling in punctuation and grammar. A student might make a free choice to submit himself to that kind of program and gain a great deal from it, but for that to be meaningful, the choice must truly be free. And the student needs to be provided with adequate buffers in case he has made a mistake in his choice.

I understand that this is more or less the way that FWC intends to use the language school. I am just pointing out the temptations, every-present, to fall back on solutions which have been tried and, we know, have generally failed to produce the kind of people and kind of world we all want.

The next question is whether this is, in any case, the best way to learn a language. I think we have all come to understand that a language is best learned in the country in which it is spoken, in which a person is immersed in it around the clock and requires it to perform all his practical tasks. That kind of requirement has meaning like a stone wall. It is not invented by an educator in some dream that he knows what is best for the student's own good.

But if a student arrives in a foreign country without any knowledge whatsoever of the language, there is great ineffeciency in his deriving much educational gain from beingthere. True enough. There is also inefficiency in his studying Spanish in Vermont when he might be taking more field trips, having more seminars, talking in greater depth to his faculty advisors and fellow students, meditating and experimenting with life in Mitchel Gardens. As in every other case one must consider what is cut out when something is added. If the program can spare him to go for two or six weeks to Vermont, can it not spare him to go that much earlier to Mexico or Bolivia?

Another concern is creeping essentialism. FWC recognizes that no student can be expected to learn the language of every country in which he is to study. On what grounds is it decided that he must learn the language of the first country in which he is to study? It is common knowledge that one gets more out of a foreign experience if he knows the language. But that "common knowledge" itself needs to be examined. What does "more" mean? He gets different things - and perhaps things which are more desirable. By the same token he would learn more if he stayed in a country a year rather than six months. He might well learn more about the United States by staying here than by going abroad. These are all choices, and I think the program can comfortably rest on the option it is offering students to spend periods of six months or more in each of six environments outside the United States in a four year period. Variations within that program are also possible - such as spending more time in the United States or in any ofthe countries abroad. It is quite likely, by the nature of things, that the student will become fluent in one or more languages in that experience. I see no need to require such fluency of anyone, especially if some facilities for language-learning beyond direct experience are available in each of the countries. If it were my choice, I would make these records, tapes, and other audio-visual material which could be used on an individual, random -access basis, rather than by instituting classes and courses.

My impression was that FWC is moving toward even greater individualization of learning patterns, permitting more independent projects in the United States or elsewhere, more independent travel, more flexibility of scheduling. All this seems to me to be to the good. I see no reason to be bound to the semester format at all. Specific study programs might begin and end at a variety of times in

each of the centers. Students might be free to go from country to country as inexpensive travel accommodations could be made, and co-ordinated with the individual student's desires. I would hope that in each country there might be some kind of a Center where faculty advisors, living accommodations, and some study facilities are available - and these be in operation twelve months of the year. As more students come into the system such a free-flowing arrangement will be both more feasible and more complex. It may be that some kind of a computerized reservation system, such as is used by motel chains and airlines, may be necessary to keep track of where people are and where there will be demands for facilities.

I think FWC has found as workable a compromise with the accreditation and evaluation demands of the system as any program I know of. It is very similar to that used by Antioch-Putney and probably will be adapted to Antioch-Columbia. At the same time it is, of course, ludicrous. The transcript sheets, with their invented course titles such as "Contemporary European Problems" or "Folk Culture of Mexico", with numbers affixed such as two credits or three credits, are in one respect hypocritical and in another respect very amusing. At the same time I recognize they are necessary ways of coping with extraneous demands.

Most of the evaluative comments of faculty which I read were the sort of thing which needs to be paid person-to-person---and probably were said that way. I see no great need to record subjective judgments about a person's progress and personality except in the context of describing the student's work on specific projects or in specific experiences. The folders seemed remarkably barren of descriptive comment. We have a good deal of that in the journals--but I believe the folders should contain letters and evaluations from those who knew and worked with the students in the field--not necessarily faculty. The student's portfolio would be more useful if it contained more such descriptive material, examples of the student's work, summaries of his experience as perceived by others.

The present reliance on the journal may be too heavy. Though I notice that photography (and perhaps art work and tapes) are alternate ways of dealing with the journal, this may still be too limited to accommodate all talents. For example, a student of an engineering bent might best express himself in his contribution to actual field projects. He might find it very difficult to reveal himself in personal narrative, photography or other media of expression. Is he, under the present system, encouraged to collect any evidence he can (letters, diagrams, proposals, plans) which indicate the exact nature of his learning and growth?

In other words, what I would like to see is a richer and fuller story of what students actually ahve done, especially as perceived by others. If evidence can be accumulated that he really

knows something about economics, for example, or political science, or the literature of Japan, this should somehow be recorded so that the student will have a way of demonstrating what he has done and what he knows. Quantification by numbers of credits is, of course, ridiculous, but, again, probably necessary. I wonder whether a blanket 15 studytravel credits should not be given to all students who do not fail disastrously to function in the program. These could be accompanied by a discursive account agreed to by the advisor and student of the actual activities engaged in during a semester.

The degree itself is perhaps the most crucial and corrupting consideration. I should like it to be clearly stated and assumed throughout the system of FWC that non-degree candidates are welcome in the program on the same basis that degree candidates are. In this arrangement payment of tuition wouldin effect purchase a ticket to the facilities of FWC to be used on terms which FWC specifies, and the accreditation of the student's experience could be a completely separate act, a service available to the student upon request or application.

I would be inclined to try to incorporate more work experience in the program, both to help a student meet the cost of his education and to provide a structure which may be more fruitful than merely wandering around having experiences. If a student is perceived, especially in a foreign country, as having a specific function, he is much more likely to find the people he deals with open to him and cooperative with him. I realize that working for pay is extremely difficult in foreign countries, especially in the far flung, inaccessible places which so many FWC students seem to have reached. Their work experience in the field might have to be, therefore, voluntary, but perhaps more could be done to give it the appearance and accoutrements of regular work. But even as I say this I realize that, as in the case of the other issues I have discussed, a choice to do what I am suggesting means a choice not be do something else, and the something else might be more valuable. I suppose the most one might do is to make it clear that work experiences are not only acceptable but encouraged and that the staff keep their eyes open for opportunities to place students in work situations when the students ask for them.

I wish I knew what to say or do about the cost of education. It is clear that our culture is moving more toward education as a life-long process and that a portion of one's life should always be set aside for growth and development. And we have no clues as to how to meet the costs. Support of government is difficult to get - particularly for a world college program - and perhaps undesirable, as FWC is discovering. It invariably has implicit or explicit constraints associated with it, as evidenced by the tendency of state

governments and the federal government to clamp down on support when students become obstreperous. By its very nature, education, especially college education, should be restless within the status quo. To ask students to pay for their own education through tuition is bound to reinforce class differences already too rigid in our society. Loan funds, which leave students with life-time-indentures, are no solution. Dependency upon parents for financial support has the hothouse effect of extending childhood far beyond the period of life in which it is good for a person to be answerable to his parents. Church or other institutional support is likely to have undesirable constraints associated with it. Dependence upon gifts raised annually is both demeaning and burdensome, aside from the fact that it, too, makes the institution subject to approval and disapproval of an outside constituency in ways which may not be educationally constructive. In other words, I simply cannot imagine where our society is going to find the funds for the education it wants and which it is quite able to pay for.

Of these various choices, it appears that FWC has chosen private charity as its major support beyond tuition. I gather that some 50% of the budget must be raised annually. I am not aware of the processes followed or of those available, but I wonder whether it would be possible to socialize this effort with other fund-raising activities of the Friends. The Study-Travel service seems to be an admirable step in the right directions, as it markets for however slight a profit a resource which FWC definitely has - a knowledge of low-cost travel arrangements and possibilities, a fund of experience in visiting other countries for educational purposes, and a roster of people who are able educators in this mode. There may be other profit-making ventures which FWC or which the Friends might engage in of similar authentic value. If the Friends would raise funds for all their educational ventures, this might provide the best means for doing this job. This source would cause less conflict of interest than there would be in reliance upon government or state funds.

I have not begun to discuss the characteristics of the college which make it one of the most exciting educational institutions in the nation today. The democracy of its governance is a model - as there seems to be a true and complete partnership with students in all decision-making. The vision and philosophy of Morris Mitchell - as well as his delightful presence - are resources I would gladly trade for many a richer college's endowment. Operational evidence of the words of the program is its ability to hold such highly qualified and dedicated staff as well as to attract such bright and able students. I think it would be instructive for the State of New York to compare this institution with its own new university at Old Westbury. Both should, in my view, be supported against the great odds they face because of the value they have for the state as laboratories of innovation. Many of the ambiguities and perplexities of

building an alternative system are common to both institutions. At this point I would guess that FWC has been more successful in creating a coherent and effective philosophy and making it operational throughout the institution. It is too early to judge either institution, especially the state university. It will require a very sensitive and responsive state government to protect such institutions from having to make the kinds of compromises which will reduce them to mediocrity.

Incidentally, it might be interesting to try to get some relevant test data on the very tiny graduating class of FWC, using comparison with a matched sample from one of the universities in the state system - especially a very young, small one. Such data should be supplemented with essay or interview material which will permit some assessment of the knowledge of world affairs and world culture and experiential learning of FWC graduates.

My major hope for FWC is that it not succumb to pressures - including the suggestions I have made in this report - and to be other than it inherently is becoming. The modesty and openness to criticism which pervade FWC seem at times to invite such corruption. As our term made comments, and I saw that we were inducing soul-searching, I kept thinking of the Aesop's fable about the man, his son, and the donkey, in which there is too much attention given to the opinions of the public until all three ended by falling in the river. There is, of course, a balancing independence of mind which gave birth to the college in the first place, and I am confident that it will save FWC from trying too hard to please too many masters.